



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,154	03/25/2004	Ban Kuan Koay	70030659-1	8362

57299 7590 11/19/2007

Kathy Manke  
Avago Technologies Limited  
4380 Ziegler Road  
Fort Collins, CO 80525

EXAMINER
----------

PINHEIRO, JASON PAUL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3714

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

11/19/2007

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

avagoip@system.foundationip.com  
kathy.manke@avagotech.com  
scott.weitzel@avagotech.com

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/810,154

Applicant(s)

KOAY ET AL.

Examiner

Jason Pinheiro

Art Unit

3714

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 August 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. After the amendment filed on 08/31/2007, Claims 1-9 remain pending without change.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 4-5, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rosenberg (US 2005/009605).

Regarding claim 1: Rosenberg '605 discloses a game controller comprising: a moveable element (paragraph [0015]) (Fig. 2) having an optically readable pattern on a surface thereof (paragraph [0022]), said moveable element moving relative to a fixed position and having a position characterized by a relative position of said moveable element relative to said fixed position (Fig. 2) (paragraph [0018]); and an imaging element (Imager 16) that forms an image of a sub-area on said surface (paragraph [0019]), said sub-area being determined by said relative position of said moveable element relative to said fixed position (paragraph [0019] & paragraph [0022]), and a memory for storing a map that

Art Unit: 3714

specifies said readable pattern in each sub-area on said surface that can be imaged by said imaging element (paragraph [0018], U.S. Pat. No. 5,644,139 (abstract) which is incorporated by reference), and a controller (movement detector 56) (Fig. 4) for comparing said image to said map to determine said position of said moveable element (paragraph [0025]).

Regarding claim 4: Rosenberg discloses that said controller generates a signal indicative of a rotation of said moveable element about a predetermined axis on said moveable element (Paragraph [0027])(Fig. 2).

Regarding claim 5: Rosenberg discloses that said moveable element comprises a handle (paragraph [0016]).

Regarding claim 8: Rosenberg discloses that said map comprises a plurality of sub-maps that are rotated relative to one another (Paragraph [0027]).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Rosenberg (US 2005/009605) in view of Chen et al (US 2003/0020690).

Rosenberg discloses that which is discussed above. However Rosenberg does not disclose that said pattern comprises a plurality of randomly distributed spots.

Chen '690 does disclose that said pattern comprises a plurality of randomly distributed spots (Paragraph [0023])(Fig. 9).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the teachings of Chen into the teachings of Rosenberg in order to yield the predictable result of creating a more defined surface to create an image of and therefore create a more accurate game controller.

6. Claims 3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg (US 2005/009605) in view of Liebenow (US 6078312).

Regarding claim 3: Rosenberg discloses that which is discussed above. However Rosenberg does not disclose that said controller generates a signal

indicative of a position of said movable element in terms of first and second orthogonal displacements from a reference position.

Liebenow '312 does disclose that said controller generates a signal indicative of a position of said movable element in terms of first and second orthogonal displacements from a reference position (Col. 5, Line 11 – Col. 6, Line 37);

Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the teachings of Liebenow into the teachings of Rosenberg in order to yield the predictable result of creating a more accurate game controller.

Regarding claim 6: Rosenberg discloses that which is discussed above. However Rosenberg does not disclose that said handle comprises a shaft with a shaft axis parallel to said predetermined axis (Fig. 5).

Liebenow does disclose that said handle comprises a shaft with a shaft axis parallel to said predetermined axis (Fig. 5).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the teachings of Liebenow into the teachings of Rosenberg in order to yield the predictable result of creating a more accurate game controller.

7. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg (US 2005/009605), as applied to claim 5 above.

Regarding claim 7: Rosenberg discloses that which is discussed above.

Although Rosenberg does not specifically disclose a push button having a state that is sensed by said controller, it is well known in the art that joysticks often include additional buttons to provide additional inputs for the user, in order to make a more versatile game device for a player to use (paragraph [0016]).

8. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg (US 2005/009605).in view of Drake (US 7046229)

Regarding claim 9: Rosenberg discloses that which is discussed above.

However Rosenberg does not disclose that a plurality of search processors, each search processor comparing a portion of said map with said image formed by said imaging element.

Drake '229 does disclose search processors, each search processor comparing a portion of said map with said image formed by said imaging element. (Col. 11, Lines 14-60). Although Drake does not specifically disclose a plurality of search processors, it is well known in the computer art to use multiple processors to conduct a specific task to increase the speed of completing the computing task.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the teachings of Liebenow into the teachings of Rosenberg in order to yield the predictable result of creating a more accurate game controller.

***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments, see Response to Office Action, filed 08/31/2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-9 under 35 USC § 102(e) & 35 USC § 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of a new interpretation of the previously presented prior art references as discussed above.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason Pinheiro whose telephone number is 571-270-1350. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F 8:00 AM - 4 PM;.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Pezzuto can be reached on (571) 272-6996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JP  
11/09/2007



ROBERT E. PEZZUTO  
SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER